



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,090	03/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010053US1	7726
65362	7590	03/05/2009		
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP				
IBM Austin				
P.O. BOX 203518				
AUSTIN, TX 78720				
EXAMINER				
BLACKWELL, JAMES H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/05/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tmunoz@hamiltontertile.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/817,090

**Applicant(s)**

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

**Examiner**

James H. Blackwell

**Art Unit**

2176

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 46-49, 51-56 and 58-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 50, 57 and 64 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 12/15/2008.

Claims 46-65 remain pending.

Claims 46, 53 and 60 are independent claims.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 50, 57 and 64 are objected to as being dependent upon their rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 46, 49, 53, 56, 60 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (hereinafter Brown, "Using Netscape Communicator 4, Special Edition," copyright Jan 1997, QUE, pages 115-117) in view of Graham et al. (hereinafter Graham, U.S. Patent No. 6,582,475 filed 09/08/1998, issued 06/24/2003).

**In regard to independent Claim 46, Brown discloses:**

- *A method of processing a structured document in an application, where the structured document comprises one or more elements (Pages 115-117 → Brown*

describes a page setup dialog box invoked from within Netscape Navigator version 4 prior to printing a hardcopy of a web page that allows the user to affect the subsequent processing of the web page prior to, and while printing the web page), *the method comprising:*

- *configuring a print option, wherein the print option comprises one or more user-configurable print parameters that indicate a user preference with respect to reducing consumption of one or more physical resources during printing of the structured document ... (Pages 115-117; Figure 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins, as well as to allow the addition of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4. Manipulation of these settings would act to reduce consumption of at least paper and toner/ink. For example, reducing the size of the margins would allow more content to fit on a given page as would eliminating the addition of page headers and/or footers to each page (i.e., by un-checking boxes). This would lead to a reduction in the number of pages needing to be printed and as a result use less toner/ink).*
- *receiving a print request to print a hardcopy of the structured document being displayed within a browser window (Pages 115-117 → Brown describes that after altering page settings with the Page Setup dialog box (Figure 8.5), a user can then either preview the settings changes (see*

Figure 8.6) and then issue a print command, or can issue the print command directly);

- *in response to receiving the print request, detecting the print option* (Pages 116-117; Figures 8.6, 8.7 → Brown describes a user selecting an option to print a web page, which then brings up Window's 95's print dialog box. Hence, selection of a print option is *indicated* at least visually by the appearance of the print dialog box);
- *in response to detecting the print option, generating a modified copy of the structured document in accordance with the user-configurable print parameters ...; and printing the hardcopy of the modified structured document* (Pages 116-117; Figure 8.7 → Brown indicates that if the user foregoes previewing the web page(s) to be printed (e.g., ala Figure 8.6) and instead invokes the print command from the menu bar (or Ctrl+P) directly and clicks the okay button, the web page(s) to be printed are modified per the page setup dialog selections and/or additional settings made from within the print dialog box (e.g., indicating which pages to print), and are printed by the printer).

Brown fails to disclose:

- *...reducing consumption of one or more physical resources during printing of the structured document by modifying the content of the structured document to remove one or more of the elements prior to printing or*

- ...*generating a modified copy of the structured document for printing...by modifying the content of the structured document to remove one or more of the elements prior to printing.*

However, Graham teaches an automatic printing assistant application for documents in electronic form that allows a user to *selectively print document content*. Specifically, the user specifies concepts of interest. The system then locates those concepts of interest in the document, tags them and then highlights them in an elongated thumbnail view of the document. Those sections containing the concepts of interest can then be selectively printed through several means via the print dialog (the printed output represents a *modified copy of the structured document*) with the remainder of the document content being omitted from the print output. The user then prints the selected output which generates the modified document and prints it (see at least Col. 3, line 57 through Col. 5, line 38; Col. 5, lines 55-59; Col. 9, lines 30-36; Figures 2-4)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown and Graham as both inventions address print options that can alter print output. Adding the disclosure of Graham provides the benefit of allowing a user to obtain a hardcopy of only those sections of a large document that contain concepts of interest. This implicitly saves resources such as paper, toner, wear and tear on the printer, etc.

**In regard to dependent Claim 49, Brown discloses:**

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to include one or more additional elements in the modified structured document to indicate that the content of the structured document has been modified to remove one or more elements in response to the print request* (Pages 115-117; Fig. 8.5  
→ Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins (in units of inches, i.e. decrease left margin to 0.1 inch), as well as to allow for the addition of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4.

For example, the act of reducing margin widths to fit more on a given printed page would be indicated, at least visibly on the printed hardcopy by page content being printed closer to the edges of the page.

Brown also allows the user to choose to have text and lines to be printed in black only. In the case where the output is being sent to a color printer, the occurrence of text/lines in black only would be indicative of those prior settings).

**In regard to Claims 53 and 56,** Claims 53 and 56 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 46 and 49, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Graham discloses every limitation of Claims 53 and 56, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 46 and 49.

**In regard to Claims 60 and 63**, Claims 60 and 63 merely recite a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claims 46 and 49, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Graham discloses every limitation of Claims 60 and 63, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 46 and 49.

Claims 47, 51, 54, 58, 61 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Graham, and in further view of FinePrint (documentation from old web site, 02/29/2000, downloaded from <"http://web.archive.org/web/20000301042424/www.singletrack.com/\*">").

**In regard to dependent Claim 47**, Brown and Graham fail to disclose:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to remove one or more elements from the structured document in response to the print request.*

However, FinePrint describes a "non-printer" or "virtual" printer driver that captures printer output after the user has issued a print command and prior to the printer receiving and printing the file and provides additional formatting, control and data transfer options (i.e. *settings*). It works with all printers and is treated by at least a Windows system as another printer driver selectable by a user desiring to print documents. As such, it is also available to all applications, including, for example, a web browser.



Specifically, one feature allows the user to skip (i.e. *remove*) bitmaps (typically a graphical object) (see page 1 of 10, bullet entitled "save money!") contained in, for example, a web page.

Such omission of bitmaps amounts to the *removal of such elements* from being printed thereby saving expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, and printer wear and tear.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown, Graham and FinePrint as all three provide a user with the means to alter web content to be subsequently printed such that printer resources are conserved. Adding the disclosure of FinePrint provides the benefit of omitting certain content elements that would be more expensive to render.

**In regard to dependent Claim 51, Brown and Graham fail to disclose:**

- *filtering the structured document for printing to delete one or more elements of a specified type.*

However, FinePrint describes a "non-printer" or "virtual" printer driver that captures printer output after the user has issued a print command and prior to the printer receiving and printing the file and provides additional formatting, control (i.e. *filtering*) and data transfer options. It works with all printers and is treated by at least a Windows system as another printer driver selectable by a user desiring to print documents.

As such, it is also available to all applications, including, for example, a web browser. Specifically, one feature allows the user to skip (i.e. omit or *delete*) bitmaps (an *element type*) (see page 1 of 10, bullet entitled "save money!") contained in, for example, a web page.

Such deletion of bitmaps saves on expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, and printer wear and tear.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown, Graham and FinePrint as all three provide a user with the means to alter web content to be printed such that printer resources are conserved. Adding the disclosure of FinePrint provides the benefit of omitting certain content elements that would be more expensive to render.

**In regard to Claims 54 and 58**, Claims 54 and 58 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 47 and 51, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Gra and FinePrint discloses every limitation of Claims 54 and 58, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 54 and 58.

**In regard to Claims 61 and 65**, Claims 61 and 65 merely recite a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claims 47 and 51, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Graham and FinePrint discloses every limitation of Claims 61 and 65, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 47 and 51.

Claims 48, 52, 55, 59 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Graham, and in further view of Bickmore et al. (hereinafter Bickmore, "Digestor: Device-independent Access to the World Wide Web," 03/24/2000, downloaded from <<http://decweb.ethz.ch/WWW6/Technical/Paper177/Paper177.html>>).

**In regard to dependent Claim 48, Brown and Graham fail to disclose:**

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to remove a user-configurable amount of text from the structured document in response to the print request.*

However, Bickmore discloses *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to remove a user-configurable amount of text from the structured document in response to the print request* (Sec. 5, 3rd paragraph → describes techniques for reducing the amount of text displayed on a pervasive (PDA, cell phone, pager) device from a web page originally intended for a normal browser. It has an automated scenario that provides the user with a forms-based control of the re-authoring process. Bickmore's invention also uses a technique referred to as "First Sentence Elision," which replaces each block of text with its first sentence (or phrase up to some natural break point), and also makes this sentence into a hypertext link to the original text block (see Sec. 4.1.2)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown, Graham and Bickmore because all three inventions employ techniques to reduce the amount of resources needed to

generate a web page. Bickmore adds a feature to reduce the amount of text displayed, and perhaps printed to enable one to conserve resources.

**In regard to dependent Claim 52, Brown and Graham fail to disclose:**

- *filtering the structured document for printing to delete text within an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum amount of text.*

However, Bickmore discloses *deleting text within an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum amount of text* (Section 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph → describes techniques for reducing the amount of text displayed on a pervasive (PDA, cell phone, pager) device from a web page originally intended for a normal browser. It has an automated scenario that provides the user with a forms-based control of the re-authoring process. Bickmore's invention also uses a technique referred to as "First Sentence Elision," which replaces each block of text with its first sentence (or phrase up to some natural break point), and also makes this sentence into a hypertext link to the original text block (see Section 4.1.2)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown, Graham and Bickmore because all three inventions employ techniques to reduce the amount of resources needed to generate a web page. Bickmore adds a feature to reduce the amount of text displayed, and perhaps printed to enable one to conserve resources.

**In regard to Claims 55 and 59**, Claims 55 and 59 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 48 and 52, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Graham and Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claims 55 and 59, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 48 and 52.

**In regard to Claim 62**, Claim 62 merely recites a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claim 48. Thus, Brown in view of Graham and Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claim 62, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 48.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 46-65 and the prior art of Hoffman have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is (571)272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James H. Blackwell/  
02/25/2009

/DOUG HUTTON/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2176